DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 242 SP 022 304

AUTHOR Miles, Matthew B.; And Others
TITLE The Extent of Adoption of Effective Schools Programs. Vol. II. Review of Effective Schools Programs.
INSTITUTION Huron Inst., Cambridge, Mass.; National Commission on Excellence in Education (ED), Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jan 83
NOTE 58p.; For related documents, see SP 022 303-305.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Adoption (Ideas); Educational Research; *Institutional Characteristics; *Program Implementation; *Research Utilization; *School Effectiveness; Secondary Education; Student Behavior; Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS National Commission on Excellence in Education

ABSTRACT

A study was made of 39 secondary schools which had implemented new programs that had a research base in the effective schools/classrooms literature, that were well-defined, and that emphasized improvement effort at the building level. A discussion presenting the aims and methods of the study includes a working definition of the effective schools programs and a description of the sample schools' characteristics. Findings are reported on: (1) characteristics of the districts and community settings of the schools which adopted the new programs; (2) program targets, goals, components, types, research bases, and elementary-secondary differences; (3) timing and scope of implementation, including length, funding sources, and costs; and (4) types and degree of program impact, causative factors, and implementation intentions. A summary of findings includes a discussion on the future of effective schools programs in high schools. A list of programs and districts included in this study is appended. (JD)

REVIEW OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS

Vol. II. THE EXTENT OF ADOPTION OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS

Matthew B. Miles, Center for Policy Research
Eleanor Farrar, Huron Institute
Barbara Neufeld, Huron Institute

Prepared for
National Commission on Excellence in Education
Washington, D.C. 20208

This puboication was prepared with funding from the U.S. Department of Education, under contract #_____. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgement in rofessional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not necessarily represent those of the U.S. Department of Education.

Huron Institute
123 Mt. Auburn Street
Cambridge, MA. 02138

January, 1983

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report on the extent of adoption of effective schools programs is written for the National Commission on Excellence in Education, and will be of interest to a broader audience of educational policy-makers, program managers, researchers and others concerned with the effective schools movement.

Using a snowball sampling technique, and gathering data through telephone interviews and document analysis, we located 39 effective schools programs in 25 states, covering 875 school districts, and 2378 school buildings. A conservative estimate is that these included 367 middle/junior high schools, and 345 senior high schools, including about 40% of the schools in the sample. The programs were more frequently found in large and moderate-sized cities, and less in suburban areas, but were well distributed in rural areas.

The programs were well-defined, largely based on the effective schools/effective teaching literature, and emphasized improvement at the school building level. Two thirds emphasized effective schools, and the remainder effective teaching. Program goals were mainly student achievement and behavior, the 5 factors in the effective schools literature, and organizational improvement.

Most programs used data collection and feedback, school-wide planning teams, task forces, consulting/technical assistance, and intensive training. About half the programs were strong in use of both data collection/feedback and in implementation support; another third were weak in both.

Almost all the programs (35) were being used in secondary schools, usually with some adaptation. Program personnel mentioned the size, complexity, and departmental organization of secondary schools as promoting subject matter orientation, lack of collaboration, reduced principal power, and resistance to change. Students were seen as more involved than in elementary schools. These features make for slower, more difficult progress in secondary school improvement, but can be overcome through active involvement of departments and department heads, through task forces for problem-solving, and through emphasis on curricular issues.

Most programs had been implemented for 2-3 years, though up to a quarter were just starting, and impact judgements could not be made. For the typical program with a reasonable implementation length, about 60% of schools were said to experience clear impact. The main outcomes noted were student achievement and improved student behavior (attendance, vandalism reduction, improved discipline); the "5 factors" of the effective schools literature (leadership, orderly humane climate, high expectations, instructional focus, and student performance monitoring); teaching behavior; curriculum change; and positive organizational changes (collaboration, support, climate).

These outcomes were attributed to the structure and processes of the progams, to administrative leadership; and to strong commitment, actual classroom improvement and intensive work toward shared goals.

The typical program cost about $200,000 to develop, with funds coming mostly from Federal and state sources; program operations costs, usually only about $5,000 annually per school, were mostly borne by LEAs, with some state and Federal support. Use in coming years will expand for 80% of programs; 20% will maintain present level.

Though deeper and closer study is needed of program implementation and impact, it is fair to say that effective schools programs are widespread, are being fairly well implemented, have promise for secondary school improvement as well as elementary, and will expand in use over the next few years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

II. THE EXTENT OF ADOPTION OF EFFECTIVE SCHOOLS PROGRAMS

Matthew B. Miles, Eleanor Farrar and Barbara Neufeld

Introduction

Aims of the Study

Programs with the label "effective schools" have mushroomed within the past five years, spreading rapidly around the country. It is clear that state departments of education, laboratories and centers, and above all school districts themselves regard them as a useful approach to school improvement. Vol. I of this study, A review of effective schools research: the message for secondary schools, examines the available literature and concludes that effective schools programs can in principle be created and adapted for use at the secondary level, but that little is known about the extent, nature and consequences of current use. In particular, we lack information on the approximate number of such programs, where they originated and when, what the programs in fact include, why they were adopted, by whom and where, and what their impact seems to be. Furthermore, it appears that, to date, more attention has been given to effective schools programs for elementary schools than for secondary schools.

This study was undertaken to provide answers to the questions above, with emphasis on the implications for secondary school improvement. The Table of Contents reviews the topics we will be discussing in more detail.

Methods

Using a "snowball sampling" technique, we assembled a preliminary list of effective schools programs known to us through our literature review (Vol. I), through the suggestions of NIE personnel, a prior report of the Education Commission

of the States (Odden & Dougherty, 1982), current inquiries being undertaken by the Council of Great City Schools, and other assorted sources.

We developed a brief semi-structured telephone interview guide, covering the research questions sketched above (see Appendix B), and began using it with persons affiliated with the programs on our list; they were usually program directors, managers or coordinators. Most of them had been directly involved in program design, and were currently responsible for program operations.

The last item on the interview asked for the names of other persons or programs involved with effective schools programs, especially those that included a secondary-school emphasis. In this way we steadily enlarged our preliminary sample, and also clarified further just which programs could legitimately be labelled "effective schools". Interviewing began in November, 1982, and lasted for six weeks.

The typical interview occupied about 45 minutes, with a range from 30 to 75 minutes. Our impression is that we typically received thoughtful, non-evasive responses to our questions. However, a number of programs, particularly those at the senior high school level, were just beginning or in their first year. In those instances, responses were sometimes incomplete, and judgments were based on hopeful impressions rather than on firm experience with full implementation.

A question near the end of the interview asked for documents of two sorts: program-relevant materials (policy statements, manuals, instruments, etc.) and reports or evaluation studies. We also requested lists of the school districts currently using the programs.

When interviews were complete and the documents were at hand, we carried out coding of the interview results, referring to documents as needed. In a few cases missing information was requested in a follow-up phone call.

Effective Schools Programs: a Working Definition

What do effective schools programs typically look like? We encountered a broad range, but here is a representative example.

> The program is aimed at improving teaching practices, student achievement and student behavior. In each school building, a leadership team is convened for shared decision-making: it includes teachers, department heads and the principal. The principal and teachers receive intensive training in how to guide the process, which begins with the collection of hard data on student achievement and behavior, along with information on community perceptions of the school, and review of district policies that impact on the school. The team analyzes the data in the light of five major factors from the effective schools research (leadership, climate, teaching, expectations, pupil monitoring), and examines current practices used in the school.
>
> This review leads to the development of an improvement plan with specific changes in each of the 5 areas; the plan is carried out with careful monitoring of progress. There is a range of supportive, self-using materials. The program is designed to be managed without much external consultation or technical assistance.
>
> The program took four years and about $300,000 to develop into its present form. It is currently being used in 7 school districts, most of them urban. Included are 18 elementary schools, 4 middle schools/junior high schools, and 13 high schools. The typical add-on costs for schools are minimal, usually about $2,000 for released time for training.
>
> The program has only been in operation for a year, but data already suggest improved student attendance and fewer discipline problems. It's too early to tell about student achievement. The results seem to depend in part on how well integrated the leadership team is as it manages the process.

The underlying theme of the program is, broadly, cooperative self-study and planful school improvement, based on an effective-schools framework. We encountered many variations on this general theme, which we will describe further as we proceed. Program diversity, however raises questions about what the definition of an "effective schools" program is. We clarified the boundaries steadily as we proceeded through the study. Here is our final definition, stated informally.

Effective schools programs:

1. Are a <u>subset of "school improvement"</u> programs.
2. Are built on and/or utilize concepts from a more or less explicit <u>research base</u>. That research base usually (though not always) involves the comparison of more and less effective <u>schools</u>, <u>administrators</u>, or <u>teachers</u> in <u>classrooms</u>.

3. Are aimed at improvement at the school building level, including emphasis on school organizational functioning and/or classroom functioning.

4. Are well-defined enough to be called a "program", with clear procedures and supporting materials.

This definition, in effect, helps clarify the nature of our final sample, which is discussed briefly below. Note, for example, that it excludes many other types of school improvement programs, including organization development, which lacks the sort of research base we are emphasizing (Fullan, Miles & Taylor, 1980); most state-wide accountability or comprehensive planning programs, (most of which predated the effective schools movement); most university courses (which do not involve a building-level focus); and the great bulk of local in-service education efforts (which lack both the research base and the building focus). We also excluded "administrator academies" unless they had the research base and clear evidence of building-level work (i.e. isolated, course-like training of administrators did not qualify). Similarly, the videspread "awareness conference" which brings effective schools information to a multi-district audience did not qualify either (though such conferences were sometimes embedded in a larger program which was included). An awareness conference by itself does not imply serious building-level work.

We should also note that although we included a few "second-generation" programs adapted on a state-wide basis from one invented somewhere else, we resolutely shut off at "third-generation" programs--those which were adapted by new users from the "second-generation" ones. There is naturally a great deal of borrowing and mutual networking among program developers, but we wished to emphasize programs that were reasonably distinct and not merely late spinoffs. A future study should certainly examine the channels and methods of diffusion of these programs through American education, but that question was far beyond our scope.

Finally, we were especially concerned with programs that were currently having, or at least seriously intending to have, impact at the secondary level, defined roughly as 7th or 8th grade and above (thus including middle schools and junior high schools as well as standard senior high schools). Since we wished to show secondary-school programs in the larger context of all effective-schools programs, we did interview a few programs defining their population as elementary only.

Our Sample

In brief, by the end of our interviewing in the first week of January, we were able to locate 39 different programs that met our working definition. Thirty-five of these either had secondary schools included, or were at least in a "pre-operation" (serious planning) phase for high school application. The programs are being implemented in 25 states, and cover a total of 875 school districts, and 2378 school buildings. The details of the sample will be elucidated further as we proceed with findings. Here we should only make several comments.

1. The sample covers, we believe, nearly all state department programs within our definition, and most programs launched by labs and centers.

2. The sample probably underrepresents programs developed by local school districts. For example, we were able to reach only 15 of the 31 members of the Council of Great City Schools before closing off data collection.* It is likely that many other local districts have developed programs as well.

3. Furthermore, though we turned up only a few programs which had been originally developed at the building level, there are almost surely many more such programs in existence.

4. The sample probably underrepresents elementary-only programs, since our request for nominations was phrased in secondary-school terms.

*We should note that the Council is currently carrying out a similar inquiry with its members, with a current return of 17. Our appreciation to Michael Casserly for his assistance.

Appendix A lists the complete sample of programs, together with the numbers of districts and schools currently using them. In the body of our report, we do not identify specific programs; we are essentially dealing with aggregated data. Examples and quotes are used, but not attributed to any specific program.

Findings

In the following pages, we present tabular data on the districts, schools and community settings where effective schools programs have been adopted; on various aspects of the programs themselves (their goals and origins, their procedures, and the like); on how long they have been implemented, and with what cost; and on their impact, together with explanations. We also examine the question of secondary school characteristics and how programs address them.

The results for each table are summarized and discussed as we go. We are essentially aiming at a clear description of the current state of adoption, with a preliminary look at issues of implementation and impact. The broader question of the implications of this review for secondary school improvement is explored in Volume III of our report.

A Profile of Program Adoption

Adopting districts and schools. Table 1 shows the numbers of districts and schools of various levels in our sample using effective schools programs as of January 1983.* The table is also broken by the origin of the program.

* We have deliberately designed this table to be conservative. First, we have excluded two SEA programs that were said to be reaching 200 and 270 districts respectively. They gave no information on numbers of schools adopting, however. Secondly, we excluded one large urban district that claimed to have mandated adoption in 435 elementary schools, 75 middle/junior high schools, and 100 high schools. We do not know whether the claim is justified (more concretely, whether there is something like a "real" program operating in all schools). In all other programs, we had fairly precise adoption estimates. So the figures in Table 1 are a conservative, lower-end estimate. If the three large programs are added back in, we arrive at a figure of 875 districts, and 2378 schools (this latter figure is actually an under-estimate, since the two SEA programs would surely push the schools figure over 3000).

Table 1 Adopting districts and schools, by program origin

Origin of Program	No. of Programs	No. of Districts		No. of Schools						Total Schools	
				el		MS/JHS		HS			
		N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
State Dept	11#	259	28.7	772*	85.7#	263	29.2#	272	30.2#	1307	145.2#
Other agency (lab, center, univ)	12	130	10.8	99	11.0	93	10.3#	41	5.1#	233	25.9
LEA itself	16*	16	1.0	185	13.2	11	0.8*	32	2.1*	228	15.2
Totals	39	405	11.3	1056	29.3	367	10.2	345	9.6	1768	49.1
				(59.7%)		(20.8%)		(19.5%)			

Program N's are 9 because of missing data
* Program N's are 15 because of excluded program.

Several things are noteworthy in Table 1. First, even the conservative estimate of 36 programs in 405 districts is more than might have been expected. The average program is being used in 11.3 districts and 49.1 schools, suggesting a substantial presence.

Second, as might be expected from the history of the effective schools movement, a majority (59%) of the 1768 schools involved are at the elementary level. (We should not rush hastily to the conclusion that this is a disproportionate estimate, however; as of 1977, approximately 66.3% of all American public schools were elementary schools (Grant & Eiden, 1981).

We can see that the programs originated about equally in state departments, other agencies**, and LEAs themselves. However, the extent of adoption differs. LEA-initiated programs are reaching an average of 15.2 schools, most of them elementary. We should note, too, that ten of the LEA programs have no senior

** The 12 "others" included 5 regional laboratories, 1 R&D center, 1 university, 2 independent institutes, 1 regional association, 1 non-educational state government department, and 1 city-wide association.

high school applications at all. So a fair conclusion is that LEA-originated programs up to now have emphasized elementary programs quite strongly.

The average SEA program is reaching about five to six times as many schools as the "other" agencies, and ten times the number in LEA - initiated programs. The emphasis is still elementary, but more secondary applications are evident. Note that we are talking here only of extensiveness; the question of whether SEA programs are as intensively and carefully carried out as those originating elsewhere must remain moot at this point.*.

Finally, we can note that the average program developed by an "other" agency is reaching eleven or so districts and double that number of schools, with proportionately more emphasis on middle/junior high schools than is true for SEA's and LEA's.

The data making up Table 1 can be broken another way to help clarify the elementary-secondary balance. Essentially, of the 39 programs, there were 4 that focused on elementary schools only; 6 both elementary and middle/junior high schools; 4 middle or junior high schools only. (There were 5 programs with school level unspecified.) Thus we can see that 30 of the 34 programs where we have school-level data include schools above the elementary level, and 20 of the 34 (59%) include senior high school attention. So there is no dearth of programs directed toward secondary schools. Most secondary-school programs, it seems, are part of a more-comprehensive multi-level approach, rather than being specifically targeted to secondary schools.

Community settings. In what sorts of districts are effective school programs being used? Table 2 displays relevant data.

*The SEA programs we found covered 10 different states. In comparing them with McLaughlin's (1981) judgments of level of school improvement effort in her sample of 30 states, we found that 4 were rated "medium" by McLaughlin, 1 "high" and 1 low; no data for the other 4. It looks as if at least a "medium" level of activity is needed before an "effective schools" program will be mounted.

Table 2 District community settings, by origin of program

Origin of program	Large city	Other urban	Suburban	Rural	Total N	Unknown
SEA	11 (2%)	50 (7%)	113 (16%)	527#(75%)	701	28
Other agency	6 (7%)	41 (49%)	12 (16%)	23 (28%)	83	47
LEA itself	13 (81%)	3 (19%)	0	0	16	0
	30 (4%)	94 (12%)	126 (16%)	350 (69%)	800	75
Distribution of places in US (1970)	0.3%	4%	30%	66%		

Estimated, according to population distribution in 4 SEAs.

The top row of the table is somewhat misleading; the SEA rural percentages are probably overestimated because of the population-extrapolation method used. However, the figures for other agencies and LEA - originated programs are precise. We can see that somewhat over half of "other" - initiated programs are being used in urban settings, and that all of the LEA - developed ones are.

Are these figures "representative" of the population of American school districts? According to the Statistical Abstract of the United States, in 1970 there were 56 cities of size 250,000 or larger, roughly corresponding to our "large urban" category; 340 places of size 25,000 or larger, which is close to our definition of "other urban"; and 13706 rural places, size less than 2,500. The remaining 6146 places, size 2500 to 25,000 are ambiguously "suburban". A comparison to our percentages suggests that effective schools programs are heavily present in large cities (about half of them), overrepresented in smaller cities, underrepresented in suburban areas, and representative of rural areas.

Mode of school entry to programs. Effective schools programs are adopted by districts and schools for a wide variety of reasons, ranging from political expediency to genuine concern for the quality of education. We could not assess the balance of such motives, and contented ourself with collecting data on an important dimension of school-level adoption: the issue of how schools enter the program, with emphasis on the degree of voluntarism involved. It is often claimed that schools have to "want" to launch such programs, not be mandated or even "strongly encouraged" to do them. "Commitment" was repeatedly emphasized as a critical fctor for success by people we interviewed. Table 3 displays data relevant to the question of program entry. Note that the unit of analysis here is programs, not districts or schools.

Table 3 Mode of school entry to programs

Origin of program	Mandated			Encouraged			Voluntary			Total Programs
	el	Ms/JHS	HS	el	MS/JHS	HS	el	MS/JHS	HS	
SEA#	3	2	2	2	2	2	6	7	7	11
Other*				2	4	3	6	7	7	12
LEA itself[a]	5	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	2	16
Totals	8	6	6	7	10	8	15	17	16	39

**Figures do not add to 3 times the number of programs because programs were not always addressed to all 3 school levels.

1 program reported a mix of all 3, emphasis on "encouraged", and so coded.
* 3 programs reported encouraged-voluntary blend: coded as "encouraged".
[a] 2 programs reported mix of all 3; coded as "mandated" since that was primary mode. 3 programs reported encouraged-voluntary blend, of which 2 were coded "encouraged" and 1 "voluntary".

There is certainly a range of entry modes. On balance, only about half of the SEA and "other" programs have a fully voluntary entry mode for schools. LEAs themselves, in fact, are more likely to mandate or "encourage" schools to take part. Not surprisingly, the "other" agencies, who have no line relationship to schools--even a remote one-- do not mandate school entry.

We can also see that by and large, entry modes do not vary significantly by school level. There is a faint tendency for elementary schools to be somewhat more frequently mandated to participate (8 of 30 programs, or 27%, while the high school rate is 20%) and high schools to enter voluntarily (16 of 30 programs, or 53%, while the elementary rate is 50%) but these differences are not strong.

So schools may enter these programs in a variety of ways: voluntarily, or through direct or indirect coercion. The question of "commitment" as a success factor is not addressed by this finding, but as other studies have found (Huberman & Miles, 1982; Larkin and Kritek, 1982), commitment can often be developed after mandating or requiring the use of an innovation.

What is Being Implemented?

We need next to "unpack" the effective schools programs in our sample. What targets are they addressed to, with what goals in mind? What research base is typically behind the programs? What specific components are involved? Can the programs be sorted into "types" with any clarity? Finally, what differences do the programs take into account between the elementary and secondary levels of schooling?

The tables from this point on in the report deal with a slightly-reduced sample of 35 programs. To be included, a program had to have users from schools above the elementary level. These might have been middle/junior high schools, senior high schools or both. Such programs were often being implemented in elementary schools as well, of course, and we retain the elementary data to show the programs' contexts. But our reduced sample is of programs that can be, and are being implemented in secondary schools.

Program targets. What aspects of schools were the programs aimed at? Table 4 displays relevant data obtained by asking respondents near the start of the interview what the program's main targets were. Here again the unit of analysis is programs.

Table 4 Program targets, by program origin

TARGETS	Origin of Program: SEA (N=11)	Other (N=12)	LEA itself(N=12)
School as an organization	8	8	6
Departments or other units		2	1
Classrooms		3	4
Mainly teachers	1	2	3
Mainly administrators	2	3	1
Teachers & administrators	1	4	2
Parents	1	2	0
Other	1-students 1-district	1-varies	1-students

As might be expected, the majority of programs from all origins emphasize "the school as an organization" as a prime target. This finding may be artifactually high--after all, school effectiveness programs are supposed to deal with schools--but it is buttressed by the finding that few programs are said to deal mainly with administrators as such, or with teachers as such.* And all but one of the "classroom"-targeted programs also includes attention to the "school as an organization". Against this we should note that "departments or other units" are rarely targeted for attention----even though they form the building blocks of school organization, especially at the high school level. On balance, however, the organizational emphasis of the programs seems quite clear.

The fact that parents, and students, are rarely mentioned as targets emphasizes the centrality of professional involvement in the programs, and probably indicates that students are seen as the beneficiaries of the programs, but not necessarily as active participants.

* A closer analysis of program structure and components (see Table 8 below) shows that in spite of the organizational emphasis noted here, 10 of the 35 programs (29%) were essentially aimed at improvement of teaching. Only two programs were centrally aimed at administrators.

Program goals. What were the programs aiming to accomplish? Table 5 shows the results of a content analysis of open-end responses to an interview question about program goals ("What are you trying to accomplish with this program?").

Student achievement is clearly the most frequently-sought outcome, followed by student behavior and attitude. The five items just after student achievement and behavior, within the dotted lines, correspond roughly to Edmonds' "five factors". After that we see a cluster of teacher performance improvement items, and a larger cluster of items related to generally-improved organizational functioning. There are only two mentions of curriculum improvement as such, and one of improved external support for schools.

Table 5 Program goals

N of programs emphasizing	Goal
21	Student achievement (usually reading, math, occas. writing)
11	Student behavior/attitude (vandalism, attendance, retention, alienation, delinquency prevention
8	Improvement based on data, self-monitoring system
6	Principal's role: shift to more instructional leadership
1	Principal's role more participative
5	School climate improvement
4	Higher expectations, standards
6	Teacher performance (effectiveness, time on task, planning, better instruction)
5	Systematic planning, goal-setting
2	Teacher-administrator problem-solving
3	Improved organizational functioning, self-renewal
1	Morale, cohesiveness
1	Improved school operations
2	Improved environment, working conditions
2	Better curriculum, improved alignment
2	Public support of schools, community involvement

Basically, the distribution of these outcomes varied little by program source, with a few exceptions. LEA-initiated programs were more likely to mention climate and principal leadership; SEA programs were less likely to mention student behavior/attitude, self-monitoring, and school organizational improvement. "Other"-originated programs were more likely to mention goal-setting/planning. In most cases, however, we are speaking of differences involving an N of 4 or 5 programs, so profound conclusions cannot be drawn.

Program research bases. By definition, the programs we included in our sample were built on a research base, usually comparing more and less effective schools or classrooms. But which research knowledge was used in the design of these programs? Table 6 displays the data.

We can see a good deal of diversity. Effective schools research is naturally prominent, with Edmonds having a slight frequency edge. There is a wide range of effective teaching sources, with time on task, mastery learning, and classroom management sources most frequent.

Encouragingly, at least 6 programs mention locally-conducted research as the empirical base. The general school improvement domain (note here that we are moving away from "effective schools/teaching" research) informs a number of programs, with implementation research mentioned most frequently. Finally, there is a wide range of other prior research cited, though it too does not draw on comparisons of more and less effective schools and classrooms.

The general moral seems to be that while comparative empirical research is said to be informing most of the programs in our sample, there are ideas from many other sources being used as well.

Table 6 Program research bases, by program origin

	SEA	Other	LEA itself
Effective schools			
Edmonds	5	8	8
Brookover/Lezotte	5	6	6
Rutter	6	3	4
ES(general, synthesized, Purkey, PDK)	2	2	2
Other ES program users	4	3	2
Effective teaching			
Time on task: Helms, Stallings, Wiley, BTES, Kavkewitz	2	5	3
Mastery learning: Bloom	6	2	5
Cooperative learing: Slavin	1	0	1
Teams/games: Johns Hopkins, Epstein	0	2	1
Active teaching: Good	2	2	3
Expectations	1	0	2
Instructional mgmt. system	2	2	2
Individualized instruction: Cooley	1	1	0
Classroom management: Hunter, Kounin, Evertson	4	2	3
Prior learning: Gagne	0	1	1
Rosenshine	1	0	0
Brophy	1	0	0
Local research study	1	3	2
School improvement			
Organization development	0	1	1
Quality circles/QWL	0	1	2
Planned change: Miles, Lieberman	1	2	0
Implementation: Mann, Berman-McLaughlin, Emrick-Peterson	3	4	2
IDEA/Kettering/IGE	1	2	0
Goodlad	1	0	1
Coaching: Joyce	1	0	0
Political theory: Gray	0	2	0
Problem-solving: McBer	0	1	0
Cultural approach, empowerment	0	1	0
Comer	0	0	1
Other			
Adolescent development	0	1	0
Organizational theory	0	1	0
Rosenberg	1	0	0
Principal as instructional leader	1	0	0
Deliquency	1	0	0
NDN programs	0	0	1
Clinical supervision	0	0	1
Staff development	0	0	1
Drug/alcohol abuse	0	0	1
Eisner	0	0	1
Hilliard	0	0	1
Chase	0	0	1

Program components. What were the programs in the sample composed of? What procedures and strategies did they follow? Before proceeding to a new table, it may be useful to describe the procedures of several programs in an integrated way.

For example, one SEA program, which has diffused in slightly-adapted form to several other states, involves an eight-step process:

1. Form a school climate improvement committee with faculty, administration, parents and students.
2. Collect base-line data using standard instruments.
3. Hold awareness workshops on the school climate concept.
4. Carry out a mini-audit of the climate, using an external site visit team.
5. Set goals and brainstorm activities in a workshop.
6. Form task forces to carry out the activities.
7. Manage task forces (committee, and the principal)
8. Do summative evaluation of results.

(Principals from several schools meet in a cluster or "league" format.)

The process moves very rapidly ("It's an easy process to teach people," one user said.), with minimal external assistance, and little attention to support for implementation.

A quite different approach occurs in another program, developed at a university:

1. Awareness session for school teams.
2. Extended training course for principals and teachers on effective schools, instrumentation.
3. Formation of local planning teams.
4. Revision of instruments by local teams.
5. Data collection.
6. Feedback.
7. Planning and implementation.

(Technical assistance provided throughout.)

The core emphasis here is on very heavy initial training and an extremely thorough approach to local ownership of the data collection process (the time to first data collection is 1½ years). The actual implementation process is mostly undesigned.

Here is another approach, aimed mainly at improved classroom effectiveness, developed by a state agency:

1. Districts select a team to participate.
2. Awareness conferences on each of 4 "models" (mastery learning, student teams, active teaching, time on task).
3. Teams make proposals: which model, which schools to be involved.
4. Workshop in depth for teams by model specialists.
5. Teams write 2-year proposals for implementation.
6. Technical assistance supplied by SEA and district teams and follow-up training.

The approach here is a sort of "cafeteria" offering, with intensive training as the main delivery mode.

And to add to the diversity, here is a program mandated for use in all the schools of a large LEA:

1. Training conferences with principals on effective schools.
2. Principal, working with school-wide planning team, develops plan covering curriculum areas to be emphasized, and effective school practices. Principal held accountable for plan.
3. Community advisory committees advise on plan and budget.
4. Fall testing of students on basic skills.
5. Instruments for diagnosing effective schools factors available.
6. Feedback of test data at individual, classroom and building level.
7. Carrying out plans, often using task forces.
8. Assistance and training from supervisors, teacher support center, research/evaluation specialists, curriculum specialists.
9. Spring retesting of students.

Here, systematic school improvement has become a way of life. Yearly planning, active use of test data for guiding teaching targeted to individuals, intensive support, and a strong curriculum orientation are combined.

Perhaps these examples begin to show how differently effective schools programs may be configured. We will return shortly to the question of program "types" within this diversity. For now, let us turn to Table 7, which displays the program components used in programs in a "deconfigured" format. Before reviewing the table, we should note that respondents described program components in

an open-ended way, and we did not make an exhaustive analysis of program documents with components in mind. Thus what appear here are the more salient features, and comparisons across program origins cannot be made with much confidence.

Table 7 Program components utilized, by program origin

Program components	SEA (N=11)	Other (N=12)	LEA itself (N=12)
Awareness conference	2	2	2
Data			
Data collection instruments	6	8	4
Needs assessment	3	2	0
Site visit team	5	1	1
Classroom observation	2	3	4
Feedback			
Data feedback	7	7	4
Structure and Operations			
Policy advisory council	0	1	1
District coordinator	0	1	1
School-wide planning team	8	8	7
Principal plan-making	0	1	0
District planning team	2	1	0
Cabinet/dept. planning	0	0	1
Parent involvement	0	2	2
School goal-setting	5	6	6
Diagnosis and problem-solving	0	1	1
Task forces	2	4	5
Plan review/revision	3	1	3
Support			
Intensive training, workshops, etc.	4	8	8
Consulting/technical assistance	9	10	4
Administrator academy/ supts forum	1	1	4
Turnkey or local trainers	2	3	3
Clusters/cross-site contact/ networks	1	2	0
Demonstration sites	1	0	0
Manual, guidebook	3	4	0
Evaluation			
Documentation of process	0	0	1
Program evaluation	4	2	2

School-wide planning teams are the working structure of choice (though they are not universal), and a good deal of emphasis is placed on school goal-setting. Task forces to work on identified goals/problems are often used (less so in SEA-developed programs). Left mostly implicit by respondents is the question of plan implementation, which is assumed to "just happen"; only a few programs mention plan review or revision.

Consulting or technical assistance has a slight edge over formal training events, but both are frequently found. The effort to develop local expertise through cadres or turnkey trainers represents the next most frequent form of support. For a few programs the procedures are formalized enough to be presented in something labelled a "manual". Of course, all programs had a range of associated materials used to guide participants' efforts.

Program evaluation is salient for only a few programs, and processes are rarely documented.

The only comparisons across program origins that seem justified are (a) as already noted, minimal use of task forces in SEA programs; (2) more use of site visit teams by SEA programs, as might be historically expected; (3) less use of manuals in LEA-developed programs (speculation: they are working close to the action and feel less need to formalize); (4) less frequent use of technical assistance in LEA programs.

Program types. Could the 35 programs in our sample be sorted into meaningful types? To answer this question, we identified a series of ten different dimensions on which programs might vary. Four of these proved to be a good basis for clustering programs.*

Program emphasis: did the program focus primarily on effective schools (23 programs), effective teachers (10) or administrators (2)?

---

* The other six are discussed later in the text.

Accountability: was the program bound into the formal authority structure of schooling, with a mandated or "strongly encouraged" aspect (8 programs fully so; 3 partial; 24 not)?

Data use: were data collected and used in a reasonably thorough way (16 programs), a minimal way (14) or not at all (5)?

Training and implementation support. Did the program include reasonably intensive early training and thorough follow-up assistance (23 programs), or was support weak/minimal (12)?

Our reasoning, and preliminary sorting of the 35 programs, suggested that these four dimensions did the best job of clustering; after the basic emphasis of the program was identified, the next three dimensions seemed related to something like the "seriousness" of the program's efforts.

Table 8 shows how the program types, eight in all, sorted themselves out along these dimensions. The following text characterizes each of the program types.

Table 8 Program types, sorted by dimensions

Data Use	Program emphasis: Effective schools, Support Weak	Effective schools, Support Strong	Effective teachers, Support Weak	Effective teachers, Support Strong	Effective administrators, Support Weak	Effective administrators, Support Strong
Low	C(4) D(4)* E(3)			G(4)[a]		Hb(1)
High		A(3)* B(9)		F(6)	Ha(1)	

* Accountability emphasis
[a] Accountability emphasis for 1 program only

In Table 7, letters signify program types, and the numbers in parentheses the numbers of programs involved. What were the types? The first 5 emphasize effective schools primarily.

A. LEA effective schools programs with "teeth." These three programs were strongly supported, and were in addition mandated for school use. All had a medium to long-term time line.

B. Well-supported effective schools programs. These nine programs were also well-supported and also used data vigorously. However, all were voluntary. Seven were developed by "other" agencies, one by an LEA, and one by an SEA. Most had medium-length time lines (2 years plus).

C. Weakly-supported effective schools programs. In these 4 programs, data figured weakly or not at all, training was minimal, and there was almost no follow-on implementation support. Two were SEA progams, one an LEA, and one came from an "other" agency. Time lines were usually unspecified.

D. Revamped accountability programs. All four of these programs had been developed originally by SEAs with an accountability emphasis. When effective schools research began appearing, it was incorporated actively into the program design.* Nevertheless, the programs had relatively weak data use. Their implementation support was characteristically moderate. Time lines were short (a year).

E. Low-intensive climate programs. These three programs all dealt with the issue of school climate (the preceding 4 types emphasized school achievement, and/or general school improvement), but with low to moderate care in data collection and feedback, and minimal training and implementation support. These programs

*We collected data from 2 SEAs with pre-existing accountability programs, but where the effective schools emphasis was very minor, usually limited to materials or awareness conferences with little built-in character. They were excluded from our overall sample.

were adapted for use in an LEA, an "other" agency and an SEA, but lost some of the stronger features of the original program model in the process. Time lines were short.

Now we turn to programs with an "effective teacher" emphasis.

F. Data-using teacher effectiveness programs. These 6 programs collected and used classroom-level data actively, and also supplied good training and follow-on support. Two were SEA programs, two "other", and two were designed in an LEA. Time lines varied considerably.

G. Non-data-based teacher effectiveness programs. These 5 programs, 4 of them designed in LEAs and 1 by an SEA, made little explicit use of data in any systematic way, though they, like the programs of type F, did a good job of training and support. We should also note that 3 of these programs were generated in, and were currently limited to, a single school, which may help to explain the reduced concern with well-worked-out data collection. Time lines were medium to long for 2; unspecified for the others.

Finally, there were two programs emphasizing administrator effectiveness primarily.

H. Administrator effectiveness programs. Though, naturally many of the programs above included attention to administrators'----especially principals' -- behavior, only two programs targeted them with primary emphasis. One of the programs (Ha) had moderately strong data use, but weaker training and minimal implementation support. The other (Hb) had weaker data use, but a strong training component. One program was LEA-developed, the other by an "other" agency. Time lines unspecified.

Before making some summary comments on these eight program types, we should review briefly the other dimensions considered during the clustering process.

Program source. We have already alluded to this along the way. There were 11 SEA programs, 12 developed by other agencies, and 12 by an LEA itself.

Development mode. There were 26 programs that were essentially developed by the agency, drawing on assorted external, and internal information; 7 programs that were basically adapted with modest change from an existing model, and 2 programs that were essentially based on local research.

Historical status. There were 7 programs that basically pre-existed the effective schools movement, but incorporated ideas from it into the programs, and 19 programs that developed with effective schools/teachers ideas from the beginning; this could not be easily determined for 9 programs.

Program objectives. What were the primary objectives of the programs? 12 emphasized student achievement; 4 a blend of student achievement and behavior; 1 a blend of student achievement, student behavior and community involvement; 5 a blend of achievement and school improvement, 7 school improvement in more general terms; 1 teacher effectiveness, 3 climate, and 2 a blend of climate and student behavior.

Curriculum emphasis. 5 of the programs paid direct attention to issues of school curriculum (revising it, aligning it with instruction, etc.); 5 paid partial attention, 20 did not. The matter was undetermined for 5.

Time perspective. Here we had rather incomplete data. It appeared that 13 of the programs had a moderate to long time perspective, considering that the program would last at least 2 years for a school; another 7 programs seemed to be assuming one or at the most 2 years. For other programs (15) the question was either inexplicit, or not yet dealt with (if the program was just being launched, for example).

Now for some concluding comments. We have sorted the 35 programs into eight reasonably discrete types: of these, 18, or about half, had both an active use of data (typically seen as a base for planning, motivation and implementation) and well-carried out provisions for training and implementation support. Another 11 programs, however, had both weak data use and weak program assistance. The remaining 6 programs, in spite of weak data use, had good training and support. It can be argued that our emphasis on the importance of data is misplaced, but we believe not. The literature of planned change, organization development, and comprehensive planning all repeatedly emphasize the importance of data collection and feedback. And the effective schools movement itself relies heavily on the weight of empirical data as a basis for its claims for school improvement. We remain dubious about the enduring value of programs that rely on hasty site visits or vague "needs assessments"----or ones that simply install improvement programs without any data collection at all.

We should note too that weak training and support occurred only in "effective schools" programs, not in those aimed directly at teachers. In American schools,

there is a longer and wider history of role-shaping efforts, in-service training, etc. than of aid to organization change as such, so the weakness may be understandable.

We believe that the issue of time perspective is an important one. We could easily infer program intensity and seriousness when an informant told us that an effort had taken three to four years, and was finally having substantial impact on student achievement. But this issue was often left vague in our interviews, and it often appeared that programs were tacitly expected to last for a school year or so, after which the school would direct its attention elsewhere. (In passing, only a handful of programs spoke to us explicitly of their intention to institutionalize or build in continuing self-change and self-monitoring capability, an issue that has considerable importance for the future of effective-schools work.)

The fact that so few of the programs (less than a third) seemed to be linking their interventions directly to curriculum change and improvement is quite striking. Perhaps such linkages are being tacitly made, as when a new basal reader is adopted as a result of an effective schools program. But we suspect that programs without such a connection----especially in high schools, as we shall see in a moment----are not likely to have an enduring impact.

Elementary-secondary differences. We asked respondents who had already carried out programs in secondary schools, or were very shortly expecting to, whether they had considered differences between elementary and secondary schools during program design. They sometimes extended their responses into explanations of how their programs differed by school level as a consequence. Table 9 summarizes the themes on this topic. For simplicity, we focus on secondary schools, leaving the comparison to elementary schools mostly implicit.

Respondents from a few programs (cluster A) said there were no important elementary secondary-differences ("The process is a generic one."), but most

Table 9 Aspects of secondary schools relevant to effective-schools and effective teaching programs.

A	6 None, process is same
B	7 Size 2 Complexity
C	6 Departments are working unit (not grade level, etc.) 2 Department chair role important
D	4 Academic, subject matter focus (not basic skills) 1 Academic freedom, curricular control 2 Content-emphasis, subject-oriented 3 Specialized faculty 1 Impersonality (no one teacher knows student's total program) 1 Supposed to teach critical thinking 1 Elective subjects
E	5 Faculty weaker on classroom management; use traditional methods (lecture, desk work, not small groups)
F	4 Faculty work isolated; less communication and shared decision-making among teachers, unused to peer interaction, more difficulty collaborating 1 Low goal consensus 1 Less teacher allegiance to school
G	2 Tougher, more activist union leadership 3 More faculty cynicism, inertia, harder to change attitudes 1 More male-dominated
H	3 Principal not subject matter expert: uncomfortable, limits role to general process, review 1 Principal more preoccupied with politics external to school
I	3 Students more involved 1 Expectations are mutual among students, staff administration, not just teachers for students 2 More concern with climate, safety issues
J	1 Parents more distant
K	1 Effective schools literature is mostly elementary, not credible 1 Longer time for technical assistance, follow-up, assessment of progress 1 Assessment and measurement problems more difficult 1 Easier to find time for shared work than in elementary 1 Instructional variables differently related to student outcomes (empirically) 1 Content of school improvements varies: ex: outdoor ed for HS, peer tutoring for elementary school

people thought that the differences were substantial, and tacitly or explicitly noted that effective schools work was more difficult in high schools.

Size and complexity are naturally mentioned frequently (cluster B). Unpacking these ideas a bit further, the issue appears to be (a) the organization of teachers departmentally, (C) which creates a new, semi-autonomous structure that must be taken account of in improvement efforts. More centrally, departments (and the high school corporately) have a strong subject matter emphasis (D) and deliver instruction traditionally (E). Teachers are not only professionally preoccupied with content rather than "the whole child", but the working structure (student movement from teacher to teacher) promotes dispersion and anomie---not only for students, but for faculty, who share few common goals and traditions of shared work (cluster F).

It is also claimed (G) that faculty attitudes are more militant and resistant to change efforts.

Faculty specialization and departmentalization also reduce, it appears, the effective power of the principal (cluster H).

The fact that students are bigger and more independent, and approaching adult status means that their wishes and expectations need to be taken more fully into account (I). Parents' roles are more distant (J).

The last cluster of comments (K) refers to the ways in which effective schools programs' operating characteristics were said to differ in secondary schools. Mostly they point to slower, more difficult progress.

We should emphasize that most of the programs being used at the high school level do not differ very much from their elementary counterparts. But the features of secondary schools noted here suggest that with further implementation experience, program adaptations will be likely. When program changes were reported to us, they typically included active involvement of departments and

department heads, careful use of task forces or "quality circles" cutting across departments, attention to pressing issues of student behavior and climate as much as (or more than) student remediation and achievement, and a curricular emphasis in data collection and problem-solving.

Timing and Scope of Implementation

In this section we review data on how long our sample of programs had been in place, what the approximate scale of costs was, and who bore these costs. The effective schools movement has been hailed as a locally-generated enterprise that is succeeding without massive infusion of external funds, and we believed it important to examine the truth of such claims.

Length of implementation. How long had the programs in our sample been in place? Table 10 shows the distribution. The unit of analysis is programs.

Table 10 Length of implementation, by program origin

Origin	Pre-operational			Currently in first year			2-3 years			4 years or more			Total programs*
	el	MS/JHS	HS	el	MS/JHS	HS	el	MS/JHS	HS	el	MS/JHS	HS	
SEA	0	0	1	1	1	1	8	8	7	2	2	2	11
Other Agency	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	5	6	2	2	1	12
LEA itself	1	1	2	1	2	4	4	5	2	0	2	0	12
Totals	1	1	3	3	4	7	18	18	15	4	6	3	35

* Figures do not add to 3 times the number of programs, since some programs focus at only one level.

Clearly, most of the programs are in their second or third year of life. (82% of elementary, 62% of MS/JHS, and 75% of high school programs*). Only a few have been going for four years or more. And nearly a quarter of programs are

*These percentages draw from the figures on school level reported on p. 10.

just starting, or in a pre-operational phase. Note that senior high school programs are much more likely to fall into these categories (50% do, while the figure for elementary programs is 18%), and less likely to have lasted for two years or more.

Compari program origins, it looks as if LEA-originated programs are somewhat more frequently newcomers than those developed in SEAs or other agencies, but the differences are not large,

The general implications are (1) there is probably enough experience with these programs to draw some preliminary conclusions about their operating characteristics, acceptability to various constitutencies, etc.; (2) we must be careful in assessing judgements of received impact, especially when student achievement is considered, since a substantial portion of our sample is early enough in implementation that achievement changes could hardly be expected.

Funding sources. Where did the money for these programs come from? We asked for information on finding sources for the development period prior to implementation, and for the present (or immediately-projected) operating period. Table 11 displays the data in aggregated form.

Table 11 Funding sources for program development and operations

		Sole	Majority	Partial	None
DEVEL.	Federal	4 (11%)	5 (14%)	12 (34%)	14 (40%)
	State	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	12 (34%)	17 (49%)
	LEA	3 (9%)	1 (3%)	11 (31%)	20 (57%)
	Other	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	3 (9%)	26 (74%)
OPS.	Federal	0 -	1 (3%)	15 (43%)	19 (54%)
	State	1 (3%)	2 (6%)	15 (43%)	17 (49%)
	LEA	6 (17%)	7 (20%)	21 (60%)	1 (3%)
	Other	0 -	6 (17%)	5 (14%)	24 (69%)

We can see that development costs tend to be borne proportionately more by Federal and state sources (60% and 51% of programs have some funding from those levels). (Federal sources included NIE, Title V, Title I, and NDN. State sources included Chapter II most frequently, along with Title IV-C, but were often left unspecified.) LEA money is involved in 43% of programs. Funding from other sources (typically foundations with some businesses, universities and professional associations) is rarer: 26% of programs.

Secondly, note that operating costs shift sharply toward LEAs (97% are bearing some portion of the costs, and a substantial 37% are picking up a majority of the costs or all of them). The figures for Federal involvement are down to 46%, nearly all of it partial; for SEAs 51%; other sources remain at 31%.

So, generally, it is clear that development costs involved Federal and state participation for somewhat over half the programs, with LEAs contributing partial support. The burden of operating costs shifts decisively to LEAs, but partial funding from Federal and state sources remain important for half the sites. The role of other agencies is important both for development and operations--but for only about a third of programs. On balance, it is quite clear that multi-source funding is typical for these programs: they cannot be managed by LEAs on their own, it seems.

How do funds move when the origin of programs is taken into account? Table 12 shows the breakdown. In brief, we can see that SEA-originated programs are developed through a blend of Federal and state funds, then operated primarily through state and LEA monies. Programs developed by other agencies are predominantly supported by Federal money, then shift to LEA support for operations. Finally, LEA-originated programs rely on state and local funding, then shift mainly to local support.

Table 12 Funding sources for program development and operations, by program origin

	Program origin											
	SEA (N=11)				Other (N=12)				LEA itself (N=16)			
	Sole	Majority	Partial	None	Sole	Majority	Partial	None	Sole	Majority	Partial	None
Development												
Federal		2	5	4	4	3	1	4			6	6
State	3	1	6	1			2	10		2	4	6
LEA			1	10			3	8	2	1	7	2
Other	1			10	1	2	2	7	1	1	1	9
Operations												
Federal			7	4		1	3	8			5	7
State	1	3	5	2			4	8			6	6
LEA	1	2	7	1	2	3	7		3	2	6	1
Other			2	9		4	2	6		2	1	9

Costs. How much, in fact, does it cost to develop these programs, and to carry them out? Before turning to the data, we should note that the cost figures given us varied enormously in their precision and completeness. In most cases, in-kind costs (routine personnel salaries, mainly) are buried and do not appear at all. Furthermore, for 13-14 programs (a third of the total) respondents could not make any meaningful estimate at all. The data that were available must be seen as crude approximations. It is probably safe to say that the amounts are not over-estimated, in any case. A look at Table 13 gives an idea of the very large diversity in these crude cost estimates.

A few comments are in order. First, development of most programs is not a minor item. In most cases development lasted for a year or more, and in a few cases four to five years were required. Designing a good program, it seems, will typically cost $200,000 or so. The median program probably can be operated for about $5,000 annually per school, a relatively modest amount that is comparable to ordinary in-service budgets. (However, note that several more-intensive programs, with strong training and assistance presence, typically run substantially more, perhaps $30,000 per school.)

Table 13 Estimated development and operating costs (in thousands), by program origin

	Estimated development costs	Median	Estimated annual per-school operating costs	Median
SEA	50 50 85 100 104 304 500 1000	102	1 1 2 2 2 3 5 11 13	2
Other	30* 50 225 300 312 500 750 2500	306	2 3 3 3 4 5 21	3
LEA	13** 15 25# 28 100 180 200 400 470	140	1 2 3 5# 6 17 35 55 71	6

* An add-on program; original development costs were 312K
** An add-on program; original development costs were 100K
\# Plus piloting work costing "25%" of total staff salaries.
Plus piloting and operations costs of "25%" of total district budget.

Given the sketchiness of the data, we can only hazard a rough guess that development costs are higher for "other" agencies, and that LEAs give a larger (and perhaps more realistic) estimate of operating costs.

Program Impact

If programs are being implemented on the scale we have noted, what are the local consequences? We approached this question in several ways: by asking an open-end question on impact, then inviting an estimate of the percentage of schools positively impacted, plus a description of typical changes noticed in a high-impact school. We also examined any available evaluation data that were sent to us. In most cases we are dealing with a thoughtful, but impressionistic summary of impact evidence, supplied by a knowledgeable observer----the sort of information program managers and users ordinarily base their decisions on.

Types of impact. Table 14 reviews the sort of impact respondents mentioned when asked what their general assessment of program impact was.

Although a few programs are cautious about claiming impact, most are not. We can see frequent claims for student achievement (cluster B), and assorted student behavior changes (C). (Climate is placed here because several programs saw it primarily as a student behavior issue.)

Table 14 General assessment of impact, by program origin

	SEA (N=11)	Other (N=12)	LEA itself (N=12)
A. No data yet	1	3	2
B. Student achievement	8	6	5
C. Attendance	1	4	3
Discipline	1	2	3
Vandalism	1	1	1
Violence, safety, security	1	1	2
Climate	3	4	0
Student motivation, morale	1	0	0
D. Principal leadership	3	3	1
E. Teacher expectations, standards	0	2	6
F. Monitoring, feedback, record-keeping, assessment, diagnosis	2	2	1
G. Teaching behavior, improved instruction	2	2	2
Time on task, use of time	1	4	1
Individualizing approach	1	1	1
H. Program quality	1	0	0
Teacher materials selection	1	0	0
Curriculum alignment, update	2	2	0
Basic skills program	0	0	2
Alternate, remedial, new programs	0	0	2
Test-taking skills	1	0	0
I. Staff development, inservice	3	2	0
Organizational improvement capability	1	4	1
J. Central office involvement	0	0	1
Teacher-principal communication	0	1	0
Communication among teachers, sharing	2	0	1
SEA--administrator cooperation	1	0	0
Involvement, many groups working	1	1	2
Faculty participation	0	1	0
Coordination of resources	0	2	0
K. Planning, goal-setting, problem-solving	2	1	1
Empowerment	0	1	0
Optimism, improvement possible	1	1	0
Energy, commitment, morale, positive motivation, satisfaction, ownership	0	6	4
L. Reorganization	0	1	0
Physical improvement (building)	1	0	0
M. Positive parent, community, board relations, publicity good	1	1	1

A few programs believe that principals' behavior has changed (D), along with teacher expectations (E), especially in LEA-initiated programs. Cluster F (monitoring), another item among the classic 5 components, is also mentioned.

Cluster G includes changes in classroom teaching behavior, and H points to programmatic and curriculum change.

Cluster I alludes to staff development and organizational improvement capability, both instances of capacity change.

Clusters J and K are composed of "process" items. J suggests that a number of programs increase the amount of interaction among participants, and K is essentially motivational and affective: the feelings accompanying interaction and shared work.

L notes more-structural changes, which seem to be rare, and cluster M includes relations with the immediate environment.

Achievement and student behavior change are most frequently noted as outcomes, along with the other "classic" ES components (principal behavior, expectations, monitoring, etc.). The additional emphasis on interaction, shared work, and positive feelings suggests that organizational-level changes----as the effective schools literature advocates---are taking place as well.

Differences across program origin seem mostly non-significant, with the possible exception of minimal "affective" outcomes (K) for SEA programs (speculation: they are conducted at a greater distance from the actual organizational events involved); stronger emphasis on teacher expectations in LEA programs (recall that these are largely urban settings with many disadvantaged learners, where positive expectations are frequently stressed.)

On balance, the claims for impact are plausible. They are probably somewhat expansive, partly because program proponents were making them,

and partly because one of the interview questions specifically asked for changes noted in high-impact schools. While documents from a few programs supported some of the claims, careful evaluation was not frequently found. There is a clear need for more detailed evidence on the actual consequences of these programs, a task far beyond our scope.

Degree of impact. Another interview question, often following the interviewer comment that "no program bats 1,000", asked respondents to estimate the proportion of schools using the program which were experiencing "clear positive impact". Table 15 displays these data, which are a rough estimate of program efficacy as seen by program proponents. The unit of analysis is programs.

Table 15 Proportion of schools said to have positive impact

Origin	Not applicable (single school)	Too soon to say	Not available	Don't know	Proportion .3	.4	.5	.6	.7	.8	.9	1.0
SEA		1		2	2		2		1		2	1
Other		3		2	1		2	1	2	1		
LEA itself	3	3	1					2	2*	1		

* Respondents said "most" schools showed clear impact.

The range of claimed impact is quite wide. The median program that has been in place a "reasonable" length of time is said to have clear impact on about 60% of schools in SEA and "other" programs, and 65% in LEA-originated programs. For more than a few programs, these claims were strengthened by a detailed review of specific school sites which had not gone well and were experiencing little impact. So while the picture may be a bit rosy (in fairness, the "100%" program had less than a half-dozen sites, and acknowledged that quality of impact in them varied), it does not seem excessively so, even if allowances are made

for the fact that "impact" is rather diversely defined across the programs. It would clearly take much close field work and observation to assess the impact of these programs on particular schools in a detailed way. For now, it is reasonable to conclude that the typical program has a better-than-even chance of showing clear results (i.e. is not running into insuperable difficulties and is achieving at least some hoped-for outcomes). Recall, too, that a quarter of the programs are new enough (preoperational or in their first year or so) that it is justifiably "too soon to tell."

Causative factors. What makes these programs work? We asked respondents to think of one or more schools where the program was having clear impact, and after describing that impact, to explain why the impact had occurred. Table 16 summarizes the results, which are essentially local causal explanations, identifications of the key variables which make for program success. Once again, we are dealing with respondents' summaries of the situation, not with extended, analysis of actual local factors leading to outcomes.

Cluster A, the largest, refers essentially to properties of the "effective schools" concepts and procedures: the way the programs are designed, the believablity and usefulness of the ideas, the decision to proceed, and the data collection and feedback process.

In cluster B we see the importance of the principal's role. Note that the principal can be changed by the process. One respondent noted: "The process will either change a dictatorial principal's behavior, or abort." Cluster C asserts the importance of policy and administrative support at higher levels.

Clusters D and E deal with motivation. D is pre-existing motivation, and E alludes to motivations aroused during the change process. We have already noted the importance of affective changes; here they are seen as explaining received impact.

Table 16 Explanations for program impact

	3	Too early to tell
	3	No data
	6	Design of systematic process; nature of mechanism/structure set up
	1	Process is self-sustaining
A	5	Effective schools concepts: provide common language, are credible, set expectations, framework of belief statements, show what's important
	1	The decision to do it
	2	Data collection, assessment, knowledge of results
	1	Threat of budget disapprovals (public data on school performance)
	8	Principal is strong, committed, participative
B	2	Process itself strengthens principal (or P withdraws/aborts)
	1	Expert support to principal
C	4	Central office leadership, support
	2	Board commitment, pressure
D	1	Urgent need
	1	Results wanted
	3	Ownership, involvement
	3	Hard work, energy, excitement
E	2	Process provides common focus for energies
	1	Atmosphere right
	1	Hawthorne effect
	1	Talented people with good ideas
	2	Nucleus of committd staff, converts, leaders
F	1	Networks of mutual support, improved communication structure
	2	People can work together (past experience)
	3	Shared work, get to know each other, better climate
	1	All in it together
	1	Teachers have "science of how to teach"
	4	Teachers change classroom behavior: leads to climate improvement, students notice, student outcomes change, students talk at home.
G	1	Teachers connect their concerns (safety, etc.) to instruction
	1	Early concrete changes (building, logistics, etc.) don't threaten teachers

Cluster F focuses on shared working relationships as a core explanation.

Finally, cluster G points out the importance of direct changes in teachers' classroom behavior and its ramifying effects on students, parents and even administrators.

The general message of Table 16 reinforces that noted in Table 14: where these programs are working well, they are said to be working because the inhabitants of the school as an organization are engaged in active collaborative

work, with shared goals. That is a far cry from traditional efforts at in-service training, and represents a step beyond the adoption of specific programmatic innovations. From such a point of view, we can be cautiously optimistic about the promise of these programs for school improvement, if they are carried out carefully for sufficient periods of time.

Implementation intentions. What do the users of these programs think about the future? Will the numbers of schools involved expand, stay the same or contract over the next year or two? We asked such a question, and the data appear in Table 17. The unit of analysis is programs.

Table 17

Origin of program	Will Contract			Will Maintain			Will Expand		
	el	Ms/JHS	HS	el	MS/JHS	HS	el	MS/JHS	HS
SEA (N=11)				3	3	3	8	8	8
Other (N=12)				1	2	1	9	9	8
LEA itself* (N=12)				1	3	3	6	6	6
Totals				5	8	7	23	23	22

* 1 program unsure, not included
2 programs single-school, not included
(Ns do not add to 3 times N of programs because some programs are specialized by level)

For the great bulk of programs, regardless of origin, the intent is to expand use; the remainder expect maintenance. No program is expecting a contraction, a remarkable finding in the light of current fiscal uncertainty. We infer that the developers of these programs, at least, consider them valuable and effective, and believe their use should be extended.

Concluding Summary

Summary of Findings

Using telephone interviews and document analysis, we have collected information on 39 "effective schools" programs, sponsored in roughly equal proportions by state departments of education, other agencies including regional labs, universities, centers and associations, and by local school districts themselves. The programs were selected because they had a research base in the effective schools/classrooms literature, were well-defined, and emphasized improvement effort at the school building level.

The 39 programs were being implemented in 875 school districts in 25 states, and covered 2378 school buildings, about two thirds of them elementary schools. However, all but four of the programs included attention to secondary schools (middle--junior high school or senior high school). The typical program is reaching about fifty schools. Programs are more frequently found in large and moderate-size cities, less in suburban districts, but are quite well diffused to rural areas.

About half the programs ask for a "voluntary" entrance by schools; the remainder "strongly encourage" or even mandate use.

Two thirds of the programs emphasized "effective schools", with the remainder mostly aimed at "effective teaching"; two programs focused on administrators. However, nearly all programs had a strong emphasis on the school as an organization. The goals emphasized were primarily student achievement and behavior, followed by changes in the "5 factors" of the effective schools literature (principal leadership, instructional focus, climate, expectations, measurement) and a wide range of organization-improvement goals.

The programs were largely based on the effective schools and effective teaching literature, with the addition of ideas from the school improvement literature as well. Components most frequently found in the programs were data collection and feedback, school-wide planning teams and task forces, consulting/technical assistance, and intensive training.

The programs could be classified into 8 distinct types, based on their primary attention to schools, teaching or administrative behavior; on their use of data; and on the strength or weakness of associated training and implementation support. About half the programs were strong both in data use and in program support; about one third were weak in both.

Program designers did note some differences between elementary and secondary schools. Secondary schools were seen as larger, more complex, with a departmental organization that provides dispersed service delivery, with a strong subject-matter orientation. Secondary school faculty members are seen as less collaborative and more resistant to change, and the principal's power as less than in elementary schools. Students are naturally more involved. All these features make for slower, more difficult progress in secondary school improvement, but they can be overcome, it appears, through active involvement of departments and department heads, through task forces for problem-solving, through attention to student behavior and discipline, and through careful attention to curricular issues. Generally speaking, however, the program differences between elementary and secondary school applications were not substantial.

Most of the programs were in the their second or third year of life, though up to a quarter were just starting; judgments of program impact must be made with care. Multi-source funding was typical for programs, with Federal, state, local, and "other" (foundations, business) money all playing a part. Costs for development were substantial, usually running about $200,000, and involved Federal and/or state funding for over half the programs. Operating costs (that

is, add-ons to ordinary budgets) are modest, running about $5,000 annually per school; local districts shouldered more of the operating burden, though Federal and state partial support still seemed required.

About 20% of programs were new enough not to have data on impact, but a wide range of types of impact was noted in the remainder. Student achievement and behavior were most frequently mentioned, as were the "5 factors". Teaching behavior and curriculum change were also important. There was a considerable emphasis on staff interaction, shared work, and positive motivation and feelings that suggested substantial organizational impact.

The typical program claims, with some support, to be having clear impact in about 60% of the schools where it is implemented. What makes for program success? The main explanations offered lay in the well-designed nature of the programs themselves and the process they evoked; the leadership and support of building and central office administrators; the presence of commitment and motivation to succeed, both before and during the process; actual classroom improvement; and intensive interaction among school personnel aimed toward shared goals.

Not surprisingly, almost all programs expect to expand the numbers of schools involved; about 20% will at least maintain them. No program expected to reduce its scale of operations.

In short, effective schools programs appear to be rather widespread, are being carried out with reasonable care, and are believed to be making enough difference that they will probably be an important feature of the school improvement landscape, in both elementary and secondary schools, for the next few years.

The Promise of Effective Schools Programs in High Schools

Although it is widely believed that few secondary-school applications exist, that does not seem to be the case. A conservative analysis shows that they

are operating in at least 367 middle/junior highschools and 345 senior high schools in the 25 states where we found programs in use. It is true that high school applications are less frequent than elementary ones----but that may be in large part because there are fewer high schools. High school programs have arrived on the school improvement scene more recently, and their efficacy is less clearly established, but nevertheless the clear intent is to expand them.

The evidence we have collected suggests that those who have developed and are operating these programs consider them fully useful for secondary schools; there is nothing inherent in the structure and functioning of high schools that contraindicates their use. Though users agree that more time and difficulty may be involved, they seem confident that relatively minimal adaptation and development are needed for successful secondary school use.

These claims may be too optimistic, and it is quite clear that deeper and more extended study of effective schools program implementation and impact is much needed. However, the claims come from knowledgeable, experienced designers and users of these programs. Effective schools programs have come by and large from the initiative of people close to the schools, and that initiative will probably be continued.

The analysis in this volume has essentially been descriptive of the current extent of effective-schools program adoptions. In Volume III of this report, we reflect on the implications for further development of practice, the conduct of research, and the policy needed to guide both.

REFERENCES

Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, Statistical abstract of the United States, 1981. 102d edition. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office 1982.

Fullan, M., Miles, M.B., and Taylor, G. Organization development in schools: the state of the art. Review of Educational Research, 50 (1): 121-183, 1980.

Grant, W.V., and Eiden, L.J. Digest of Educational Statistics, 1981. Washington: National Center for Educational Statistics. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1982.

Huberman, A.M., and Miles, M.B. Innovation up close: a field study in 12 school settings. Andover, MA; the Network, Inc., 1982.

Larkin, M., and Kritek, W.J. Milwaukee's Project RISE. Educational Leadership, 40(3), 1982.

McLaughlin, M.W. State involvement in local educational quality issues. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1981.

Odden, A., and Dougherty, V. State programs of school improvement: a 50-state survey. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States, 1982.

APPENDIX A

LIST OF PROGRAMS AND DISTRICTS INCLUDED*

Developer and program title	Elem	MS/JHS	SHS	Districts Using
Alaska				
Department of Education, Effective Schooling Project	2	1	3	Alaska Gateway, AK Anchorage, AK Mat-Su, AK
Arkansas				
State Education Agency, Program for Effective Teaching	DK	DK	DK	Approx. 470 districts
California				
Los Angeles County Schools, Quality Skill Building Program	435	75	100	Los Angeles, CA
San Mateo Public Schools, Untitled	0	1	0	San Mateo, CA
Stallings Teaching and Learning Institute, Effective Use of Time Program	DK	DK	DK	Cupertino, CA Mountain View/Los Altos, CA Sunnyvale, CA Wisman, CA Washington, DC Detroit, MI Putnam County, WV
Colorado				
Department of Education, Accountability/Accreditation Program	DK	DK	DK	Approx. 90 districts
Department of Education, School Climate Program	30	15	15	Approx. 60 districts
Loveland Public Schools, Untitled	0	1	0	Loveland, CO
Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory, Effective Schools Program	DK	DK	DK	Approx. 20 districts
Denver Public Schools, Interaction and Achievement	3	0	0	Denver, CO

* This list is organized by state of the program's developer. Many programs are being implemented outside their state of origin.

DK = respondent does not know.

Connecticut				
New Haven Public Schools, Urban Academy	28	6	0	New Haven, CT
State Department of Education, School Effectiveness Project	21	1	2	Coventry, CT Griswold, CT Hartford, CT Meriden, CT New Britain, CT New London, CT Oxford, CT Stamford, CT Vernon, CT West Haven, CT
Delaware				
State Department of Public Instruction, Untitled	54	40	26	Appoquinimink, DE Brandywine, DE Caesar Rodney, DE Cape Henlopen, DE Capital, DE Christina, DE Colonial, DE Delmar, DE Indian River, DE Lake Forest, DE Laurel, DE Milford, DE Red Clay, DE Seaford, DE Smyrna, DE Woodbridge, DE
Kentucky				
State Department of Education, School Climate Improvement	5	5	5	Buckner, KY Campbellsville, KY Clinton, KY Danville, KY Elizabethtown, KY Florence, KY Frankfort, KY Louisville, KY Richmond, KY
Maryland				
State Department of Education School Improvement through Instructional Improvement (SITIP)	50	9	9	All 24 counties
Michigan				
Detroit Public Schools, School Improvement Program	3	2	1	Detroit, MI
Detroit Public Schools, High School Recognition Program	0	0	8	Detroit, MI

Michigan cont'd				
Michigan Middle Cities Association, Untitled	DK	DK	DK	Battle Creek, MI Bay City, MI Benton Harbor, MI Flint, MI Grand Rapids, MI Jackson, MI Kalamazoo, MI Lansing, MI Marquette, MI Midland, MI Monroe, MI Muskegon, MI Muskegon Heights, MI Niles, MI Pontiac, MI Saginaw, MI Southfield, MI Willow Run, MI Ypsilanti, MI
Missouri				
State Department of Education, Instructional Management System	DK	DK	DK	Approx. 200 districts
New Jersey				
Department of Education Comprehensive Basic Skills Review	65	12	30	(Secondary users only) Pleasantville, NJ Camden, NJ Newark, NJ East Orange, NJ Orange, NJ Irvington, NJ Sussex, NJ Jersey City, NJ Hoboken, NJ Trenton, NJ New Brunswick, NJ Keansburg, NJ Paterson, NJ Passaic, NJ
Newark Public Schools, Untitled (based on study, Characteristics of High Achieving Elementary Schools in Newark)	4	0	0	Newark, NJ
New Mexico				
Department of Justice, School Climate Improvement	17	20	6	26 districts

New York				
New York City Schools, High School Improvement Project	0	0	4	New York, NY
New York City Schools, School Improvement Program	25	0	0	New York, NY
New York Urban Coalition, Local School Development Program	37	13	0	New York, NY
North Carolina				
Center for Early Adolescence, Middle Grades Assessment Program	0	10	0	Charlotte City, NC Durham, NC Greensboro, NC Johnston City, NC St. Louis, MO Pocantico Hills, NY East Cleveland, OH
Ohio				
Department of Education, and Kent State Center for Educational Development and Strategic Services (KEDS)	84	6	10	Bedford, OH Canton, OH Cincinnati, OH Cleveland, OH Dayton, OH Columbus, OH East Cleveland, OH Greenhills-Forest Park, OH Lorain, OH Mansfield, OH Shaker Heights, OH Steubenville, OH Streetsboro, OH Tallmadge, OH Toledo, OH Warrensville Heights, OH Youngstown, OH
Oregon				
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Goal-Based Education	18	4	13	Camus, WA Seattle, WA Tacoma, WA Yakima, WA See also Alaska SEA (3 districts)
Portland Public Schools, Student Achievement Policy	100	0	10	Portland, OR

Pennsylvania				
Philadelphia Public Schools, Expectations Project	6	0	0	Philadelphia, PA
Research for Better Schools and New Jersey Education Association, School Effectiveness Training	5	3	0	Atlantic City, NJ Jersey City, NJ Paterson, NJ Camden, NJ Plainfield, NJ Reading, PA
Research for Better Schools and New Jersey Education Association, School Effectiveness Training (High School Version)	0	0	1	Atlantic City, NJ
Research for Better Schools, Achievement-Directed Leadership	15	3	2	Appoquinimink, DE New Brunswick, NJ Bethlehem, PA
Utah				
Ogden Public Schools, Incentive-Productivity Model	0	1	0	Ogden, UT
Salt Lake City Schools, School Climate Program	2	1	1	Salt Lake City, UT
Vermont				
University of Vermont, Untitled	7	0	1	Cabot, VT Duxbury, VT Hardwick, VT
Washington				
Seattle Public Schools, School Effectiveness Project	5	7	0	Seattle, WA
Seattle Public Schools, Project ACCESS	0	0	10	Seattle, WA
Wisconsin				
University of Wisconsin, Wisconsin Program for the Renewal and Improvement of Secondary Education (WRISE)	0	40	20	Appleton, WI Barneveld, WI Balsam Lake, WI Beloit, WI Brown Deer, WI Cameron, WI East Troy, WI Franklin, WI Green Bay, WI Hartford, WI

Wisconsin cont'd

				Hartland, WI Juda, WI Keshena, WI Maple, WI Mequon, WI Milton, WI Oconto Falls, WI Plymouth, WI Port Edwards, WI Portage, WI Prairie du Sac, WI Rhinelander, WI Seymour, WI Sheboygan Falls, WI Watertown, WI Waunakee, WI Wauwatosa, WI Whitefish Bay, WI
Milwaukee Public Schools, Project RISE (Rising to Individual School Excellence)	18	1	0	Milwaukee, WI

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW GUIDE

SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS PROGRAMS
REVISED INTERVIEW GUIDE

Date_____

Interviewer_____

1. NAME_____ 2. PHONE_____

3. ORGANIZATION and ADDRESS:

4. NAME or TITLE OF PROGRAM:

5. GENERAL PURPOSE OF PROGRAM:

a. School level aimed at: elementary _____
middle school/JHS_____
high school

b. Target of change: School as an organization____
Depts. or other units _____
Classrooms _____
Mainly teacher _____
Mainly administrators _____
Parents _____
Other (who?) _____

c. What are you trying to accomplish with this program? What are its goals?

d. What are the components of the program, the procedures etc. ?
(BE SURE TO ASK ABOUT INSTRUMENTS USED)

6. What are the origins of the program? Who was involved in developing it?
(PROBE FOR RESEARCH BASE)

In planning, were differences between elementary and secondary considered? What?

7. ADOPTION:

a. Developer question: how do schools enter this program? (voluntary, required, encouraged). (ASK THIS OF LEAs WHO HAVE DEVELOPED THEIR OWN PROGRAM)

Does this aspect differ for elementary, middle/JHS, high school?

Are there any other criteria for entry? Do they differ by school level?

b. School district question (IF USING A PROGRAM DEVELOPED ELSEWHERE) Why did you pick this program? How do schools in your district enter this program (voluntary, required, encouraged)? Does that differ by school level?

Are there any other criteria for entry? Do they differ by school level?

8. IMPLEMENTATION:

a. When was first implementation? _____at elem. school level
_____at MS/JHS level
_____at high school level

b. Current number of districts using: _____

(ASK FOR A LIST OF DISTRICTS AND CONTACT PERSONS)

c. Current number of schools using: (ASK FOR A LIST OF SCHOOLS AND CONTACT PERSONS)

____elementary schools
____middle/jr. high schools
____high schools

d. Main problems encountered in implementation; any differences in problems at the secondary and elementary levels?

(Implementation, cont'd)

e. Any plans to change the program: expand, reduce, add parts, eliminate parts, etc.? How and why? Any differences between elementary and secondary schools?

f. Do you think the use of the program will, over the next year or two:

expand, include more schools?_____ Does this differ by school level?
stay about the same ? _____
decrease, decline? _____

9. FUNDING SOURCES:

	FOR DEVELOPMENT	FOR OPERATIONS
a. Federal funds	%_____	%_____
State funds	%_____	%_____
LEA funds	%_____	%_____
Other	%_____	%_____

Program sources:_____ (Voc Ed, IV-C, etc)

Sources:_____ (foundations, business, univ. etc

b. Roughly what was total amount spent on development? $_____

Roughly, how much does it cost for operating the program? (express as $ per school if possible) $_____per school.

c. Any linkage between LEA and other agencies (lab, center, SEA, prof. assoc.)?

10. IMPACT

a. General assessment of impact:

b. What proportion of schools using the program would you say show clear impact? _____% (or express as N impact over total N)

Does that proportion of impact differ by school level?

(Impact, cont'd)

b. For schools with clear impact, what aspects of schools are improved? Give reasons, explanations.

c. For schools with little impact, explain reasons for little impact.

d. How could the program's impact be improved?

11. What materials are available on the program?

TITLE	HOW AVAILABLE	WILL SEND

12. What reports, studies, evaluations etc. are available? (GET ELEMENTARY AS WELL AS SECONDARY)

TITLE	HOW AVAILABLE	WILL SEND

13. Other agencies and LEAa doing SE programs in secondary schools

AGENCY OR LEA	ADDRESS	CONTACT PERSON	PHONE

THANKS.

Summarize what stuff they will send, and (if anything) what we will send.
Give address.